



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,172	03/25/2004	Timothy S. Pack	MS307451.1/MSFTP607US	6811
27195 7590 05/21/2008 AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/21/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

doctet1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/809,172

Applicant(s)

PAEK ET AL.

Examiner

KIMBERLY LEVEL

Art Unit

2167

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Applicant's arguments filed 15 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to applicants' arguments on pages 9-10 of the Remarks in regards to claim 1, the applicants state "Roberts et al fails to teach displaying a detailed subset of information, including textual information, in the lens component based upon the search result, where the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result." The examiner agrees that Robert et al fails to explicitly disclose this limitation in its entirety. However, Roberts does disclose in Section 3, 5th paragraph and Section 4.1, 1st paragraph the concept of "including additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component."

Referring to applicants' arguments on page 10 of the Remarks in regards to claim 1, the applicants state "However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Pook et al fails to teach animating a subset of information to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from a search result for insertion into the subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Pook et al teaches that static portals can be used in semantic zooming." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Pook discloses in Section 1, lines 6-10, that "The users can then zoom (or enlarge) a section of the view they find interesting. The graphical objects will get bigger until, as soon as there is enough room on the screen, they are replaced by other graphical objects showing the underlying information in more detail." The concept of zooming is considered to include the step of animating, since during zooming, the object is continuously increasing or decreasing in size until it reaches the requested level of detail and which then the object settles into that level. Also, in order for the level of detail to increase, additional information has to be displayed with the object.

Therefore, the combination of Roberts and Pook is considered to teach all of the claim limitations.

Independent claims 21 and 25 are maintained for the same reasons mentioned above in regards to claim 1.

Since the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al is considered to teach the limitations of claim 1, the rejections of claims 13, which is dependent on claim 1 is maintained.

Since the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al is considered to teach the limitations of claim 1, the rejections of claims 14, which is dependent on claim 1 is maintained.

Referring to applicants' arguments on page 13 of the Remarks in regards to claim 18, the applicants state "However, Szabo fails to teach progressively inserting additional information associated with a search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Szabo discloses that when a hover trigger occurs, additional information is inserted. Therefore, inherently when the mouse moves away from the object, additional information is no longer inserted. The examiner is considering the time that the mouse is near the object as disclosed by Szabo as being the time the mouse hovers.